

CASS, AND TAYLOR

ON THE

SLAVERY QUESTION.

"Fight for the Truth until death, and the LORD shall fight for thee."

BOSTON:
16 DEVONSHIRE STREET...DAMRELL & MOORE.
1848.

WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE?

THE establishment of a National Bank is an "obsolete idea," by the confession of its friends. The questions of the Tariff and the Distribution of the Proceeds of the Public Lands, are at rest for many years, for until the vast debt incurred in the Mexican war (amounting, by the President's confession, to eighty millions of dollars) is paid, we must have a tariff, and shall not be able to divert from the National Treasury any of the proceeds of the public lands. Prominent Democrats — as the late Silas Wright — agree with prominent Whigs, that our western rivers and harbors are to be improved at the national expense. But these are *all* the questions which have divided the two great parties — the Whigs and Democrats — for several years.* Is there, then, really no great question before the country upon which opinions are divided? There is one — one in comparison with which all the others are utterly insignificant — but it is wholly discarded by the two great parties as a test of party allegiance. It is the question whether the territory now free — covering in extent five hundred and twenty-six thousand square miles, shall remain free, or shall be converted into slave territory. It is the question whether a great moral curse shall be immensely extended — whether an institution which degrades free labor, by making the laborer a vendible commodity, shall be extended to the Pacific, over territory made free by semi-barbarous Mexico — whether the slave power which has ruled this country for so many years, and which has been so solemnly denounced by our Legislature,* shall be still further strengthened. These are great questions, solemn questions, which we should put to ourselves and seriously and resolutely answer.

On this great question there is no difference between the two great

*The veto power is sometimes spoken of as *the* great question in the ensuing election. We all admit that an *unconstitutional* act of Congress should be vetoed. But it is urged by the Whigs that a President ought not to use the Veto power in any *other* case, except only where there is "manifest haste and want of consideration by Congress." (Gen. Taylor's letter to Capt. Allison). In other words, even if a law is considered by the President to be clearly injurious to the public interest, still, if it is not clearly unconstitutional — or if there has been no "*manifest haste, and want of consideration by Congress*" in passing it, the President ought not to veto it! That is, the Whigs say that the President ought to cease to be the *adviser* of Congress. But the constitution *requires* the President from time to time, to recommend to the consideration of Congress "Such measures as he shall judge necessary and *expedient*," that is, it requires him to *advise* Congress.

*THE LEGISLATURE OF MASSACHUSETTS, IN 1847, declared its "UNALTERABLE CONVICTION that a regard for the *fair fame of our country*, for the *principles of morals*, and for that *righteousness which exalteth a nation*, SANCTIONS AND REQUIRES ALL CONSTITUTIONAL EFFORTS FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF THE UNJUST INFLUENCE of the slave power, and for the abolition of slavery within the limits of the United States."

parties. Retaining their party names, which in years past have indicated a clear line of difference, the whigs and democrats now stand before the country without claiming as peculiar to themselves a single great measure of the slightest practical consequence! They propose to keep up the fight when nothing remains of their principles worth fighting for or against. They propose to go into the contest upon issues which have either become obsolete, or which are practically at rest for a dozen years to come! at the same time both parties have set aside this great—this all-absorbing question of the extension of slavery.

The democratic party have nominated

LEWIS CASS.

Gen. Cass was born and educated at the north. In 1846, when the Two Million Bill, as it is called, came before the Senate, with the Wilmot Proviso in it, and Senator Davis, of this State, talked against time, thereby preventing a vote in the Senate on its passage, Gen. Cass expressed his regret that the course pursued by Mr. Davis had prevented him from recording his vote in favor of the Proviso. At the next session of Congress, (March 1, 1847), the Three Million Bill came before the Senate, but without the Proviso in it. Mr. Upham, the Senator from Vermont, moved to amend the bill by inserting the Proviso. Gen. Cass rose, and in a speech of some length, *opposed the amendment*, on the ground that it was not the proper bill to connect the Proviso with, it being the object of the bill to enable the President to procure a peace with Mexico. In 1846, and perhaps in the early part of 1847, Gen. Cass therefore openly avowed himself in favor of the Wilmot Proviso, or the restriction by Congress of the further extension of slavery. But the subject of the Presidency coming up, Gen. Cass wrote to Mr. Nicholson, of Tennessee, a letter from which the following extracts are taken.

“ Washington, Dec. 24, 1847.

“ DEAR SIR :—I have received your letter, and shall answer it as frankly as it is written.

“ You ask me whether I am in favor of the acquisition of Mexican territory, and what are my sentiments in regard to the Wilmot Proviso. * *

“ The Wilmot Proviso has been before the country some time. It has been repeatedly discussed in Congress, and by the public Press. *I am strongly impressed with the opinion that a CHANGE has been going on in the public mind upon this subject—in MY OWN as well as others*; and that doubts are revolving themselves into conviction, that **THE PRINCIPLE IT INVOLVES SHOULD BE KEPT OUT OF THE NATIONAL LEGISLATURE**, and left to the people of the confederacy in their respective local governments.

“ Briefly, then, *I am opposed to the exercise of any jurisdiction by Congress over this matter*; and I am in favor of leaving to the people of any territory which may be hereafter acquired, the right to regulate it for themselves under the general principles of the Constitution. Because—

“ 1. *I do not see in the Constitution any grant of the requisite power to Congress*; and I am not disposed to extend a doubtful precedent beyond its necessity—the establishment of territorial governments when needed—leaving to the inhabitants all the rights compatible with the relations they bear to the Confederation.

“ 2. Because I believe this measure, if adopted, would weaken, if not impair the Union of the States; and would sow the seeds of future discord, which would grow up and ripen into an abundant harvest of calamity.

* * * * *

“ The Wilmot proviso seeks to take from its legitimate tribunal a question of domestic policy, having no relation to the Union as such, and to transfer it to another, created by the people for a special purpose, and

foreign to the subject matter involved in this issue. By going back to our true principles, we go back to the road of peace and safety. Leave to the people who will be affected by this question, to adjust it upon their own responsibility, and in their own manner, and we shall render another tribute to the principles of our government, and furnish another guaranty for its permanence and prosperity.

I am, dear sir, respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
LEWIS CASS.

A. O. P. NICHOLSON, Esq., Nashville, Tenn.

It is clear from these extracts that Gen. Cass now considers the Wilmot Proviso as *unconstitutional*—and, as every President is bound by his oath to “preserve, protect and defend the Constitution,” he would accordingly *veto* the Proviso if passed by Congress. The Washington Union (of Aug. 1, 1848)—his own ardent supporter, upon this point says,

“We are happy to understand by private letters that Gen. Cass firmly stands to the ground which he has taken. Being applied to formally by a man or two of the Wilmot stamp, he declared unhesitatingly that he adhered to his Nicholson letter, and to the Baltimore Platform, and that if elected President HE WOULD VETO THE WILMOT PROVISIO.”

Notwithstanding Congress has, on nine different occasions, passed laws forbidding the extension of slavery into various portions of the national territory—notwithstanding these laws have been approved by Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Jackson, (not to mention President Polk), under the sanction of their presidential oaths, it is now said that it is contrary to the Constitution for Congress to prevent the extension of slavery to the Pacific! If a power which has been exercised so often, and whose exercise has received such sanction, is unconstitutional, what power *can* be said to be constitutional? The Democratic party stand before the country with a candidate thus pledged *to veto the only method there is of securing the blessings of liberty!* For no one really believes that the slaveholders who are about moving to California and New Mexico with their slaves, will themselves, in their local legislature, abolish slavery. Whether or not the population of New Mexico and California are to remain freemen, is a question which can only be definitely settled by Congress; and, according to the Democratic platform of principles, Congress is not to be allowed to prevent the extension of slavery!

The Whig party have nominated

ZACHARY TAYLOR.

Gen. Taylor was born and educated at the South, and is now a Louisiana slaveholder. *He is a slaveholder in that section of the country where slavery exists in its worst forms.*

“The civil code of Louisiana provides,

“Art. 2500. The latent defects of *slaves and animals* are divided into two classes: vices of *body*, and vices of *character*.

“Art. 2502. The *absolute vices of slaves* are *leprosy, madness and epilepsy*.

“Art. 2503. The *absolute vices of horses and mules* are *short wind, glanders and founder*.

The following advertisement is taken from the New Orleans Bulletin:—

"NEGROES FOR SALE.—A negro woman 24 years of age, and has two children, one eight and the other three years. Said negroes will be sold *separately* or together, as desired. The woman is a good seamstress. She will be sold low for cash, or *exchanged for groceries*. For terms apply to
MAYHEW, BLISS & Co., 1 Front Levee."

The New Orleans Picayune, of October 18, 1846, contains the following:—

"CREDIT SALE OF VALUABLE NEGRO MECHANICS, &C.

"BY BEARD, CALHOUN & Co., Auctioneers,—Will be sold at auction on Tuesday, the 20th October, at 12 o'clock, at Bank's Arcade—the following valuable Slaves:

"EZEKIEL, 25 years, a *superior Carpenter*, fully guaranteed.

"JACOB, 25 years, a *superior Carpenter and Wheelwright*, fully guaranteed.

"CHARLES, 28 years, Engineer and rough Carpenter.

"DICK, 35 years, a *superior Carpenter and Wheelwright*, fully guaranteed.

"CHARLES, 22 years, Field Hand, fully guaranteed, excepting slightly ruptured.

"SANCHE, 26 years, *good house Carpenter*, fully guaranteed.

"MARIA, mulatress, 28 years, first rate Washer and Ironer, fully guaranteed.

"MARIA, negress, 13, Child's Nurse, fully guaranteed.

"Terms—Twelve months' credit for notes drawn and endorsed to the satisfaction of the vendor, with mortgage on the property, bearing interest 8 per cent. per annum, from date of sale until paid. Slaves not to be delivered until the notes are approved of.

"The servants can be seen on the morning of sale.

"Act of sale before D. I. Ricardo, notary public, at the expense of the purchaser.
Oct. 1846."

The following advertisement is taken from the Madison Journal, published (Nov. 26, 1847), at Richmond, La., only three counties removed from where Gen. Taylor lives.

NOTICE.

"The subscriber, living on Carroway Lake, on Hoe's Bayou, in Carroll Parish, sixteen miles on the road leading from Bayou Mason to Lake Providence, is ready with a pack of dogs to hunt runaway negroes at any time. These dogs are well trained, and are known throughout the Parish. Letters addressed to me at Providence will secure immediate attention.

"My terms are five dollars per day for hunting the trails, whether the negro is caught or not. Where a twelve hours' trail is shown, and the negro not taken, no charge is made. For taking a negro, 25 dollars, and no charge made for hunting.
JAMES W. HALL."

The St. Francisville, (La.) Chronicle of Feb. 1, 1839, gives the following account of a "negro hunt," in the parish next but one to that in which Gen. Taylor lives.

"Two or three days since a gentleman of this parish, in hunting runaway negroes, came upon a camp of them in the swamp on Cat Island. He succeeded in arresting two of them, but the third made fight; and, upon being shot in the shoulder, fled to a sluice, where the dogs succeeded in drowning him before assistance could arrive."

He comes from a section of the country where the most ultra slavery notions prevail. Three quarters of the representatives and one of the senators of the state are Democrats. These senators voted invariably with John C. Calhoun, in the recent exciting debates on the Compromise and Oregon bills; and Jefferson Davis, the senator from Mississippi, and the son-in-law of Gen. Taylor, proposed an amendment to the first Oregon bill, depriving the people of Oregon, *contrary*

to their expressed wishes, of the power to prohibit the introduction of slavery whilst Oregon should continue a territory !

At the South, he was first suggested as the candidate for the Presidency, by ultra slavery men. Thus at the Convention of delegates of the Whig party of Georgia, held May 8, 1848, for the purpose of appointing delegates to the Philadelphia Convention, the following resolution was passed :—

“ Resolved, That the nomination of Gen. Zachary Taylor for the Chief Magistracy of this Union meets the hearty concurrence of a majority of this Convention ; but, in the spirit of a just and liberal concession, we stand prepared to support HENRY CLAY, or any other Whig who may be the nominee of the Whig party, *provided the views of the nominee accord with our own on the subject of the Wilmot Proviso and Southern rights.*”

What their own views on the Wilmot Proviso were, they declared by a resolution approving of John C. Calhoun's course on the slavery question !

He was eminently the candidate of the slave states in the Philadelphia Convention. Those states had 110 votes. Of these he received 82 on the first ballot ; whilst of the 166 votes held by the free states he received only 27 !

He is now supported by ultra slavery men. In his support stand forth Ex-Governor Hammond and Isaac E. Holmes, the South Carolina Democrats, and Judge Berrien, the leader of the southern wing of the Whig party, the two last of whom took the same ground as John C. Calhoun, namely—that the people of Oregon ought to be explicitly prevented by Congress from excluding slavery ! The following extracts express the opinions of those southern men who are *friendly** to the election of Gen. Taylor.

The following is taken from the Richmond Whig.

“ TAYLOR AND FILLMORE IN THE SOUTH.

“ In looking over the accounts of the Whig meetings through the State, we discover that those persons who constitute them are composed, in a very great degree, of the *largest slaveholders among us*. They, it seems, are perfectly willing to trust Taylor and Fillmore—they have no fears for the safety of their property—they do not believe that the Whig candidates will, if elected, do any thing to impair their right to their property, or to weaken their grasp upon it. It is those disinterested gentlemen, who have no slaves themselves, that are principally alarmed on the subject.

“ Those who really would be injured by any assault upon Southern rights or Southern property, feel themselves assured, if other assurances were wanting, by the fact that *Zachary Taylor is himself a slaveholder*, and that he can do nothing to injure them which will not also injure himself at the same time. If a man goes on board of a ship to cross the Atlantic, does he require bond and security — does he ask pledges of the captain that he will carry him safe to the end of his voyage ? Certainly he does not. He knows that the danger of the one is the danger of the

* As it is not in accordance with common sense to go to a man's enemies to find out what his real opinions are, so it is not in accordance with common sense to attempt to prove that Gen. Taylor is in favor of the Wilmot Proviso from the declarations of his enemies at the South. We should all say that the Boston Post was edited by a fool, if it quoted the following, from the Richmond (Va.) Republican (a Taylor paper), to prove that Gen. Cass was in favor of the Proviso :—

“ Now is the time for action. Now, fellow-citizens, while the genius of liberty wings its flight over your destinies. Now, while you see in the South a ‘ brilliant star,’ in the person of Zachary Taylor — which will rule the people with moderation, regarding the Constitution as his shield and protector — who is identified with, and will be devoted to, your institutions. Who, by his express declaration, says he will veto the Wilmot Proviso. While, on the other hand, you see the Northern star of internal abolitionism, in all its frightful mien, with giant strides, following in the track of Lewis Cass, fresh from the ‘ bed of hell.’”

other also. He knows that if the ship go to the bottom, the Captain and crew must go along with the passengers. COMMUNITY OF INTEREST AND OF DANGER IS THE STRONGEST PLEDGE HE COULD POSSIBLY GIVE, AND THAT HE GIVES BY THE VERY TERMS OF HIS UNDERTAKING.

"So it is with Zachary Taylor. WHY ASK PLEDGES OF HIM UPON THE SUBJECT OF SLAVERY, WHEN THE FACT THAT HIS WHOLE ESTATE CONSISTS OF LAND AND NEGROES, AND THAT WHEN THEY GO HE MUST BE A BEGGAR, IS THE VERY STRONGEST PLEDGE HE COULD POSSIBLY GIVE. Has Lewis Cass given any such pledges as this? Is his interest the same with that of the slaveholder? If every slave in the Union should be liberated to-morrow, does he lose anything by it?

"If it can be supposed that he will be a watchful guardian over the interests of the South, IS IT NOT FAIR TO SUPPOSE THAT ZACHARY TAYLOR WILL BE FAR MORE SO?"

The Richmond Times (June 13), says, "We have, as our candidate, an honest citizen of Louisiana, *thoroughly identified with the South in feeling and interest.*"

The Nashville (Tenn.) Banner says:—

"A Louisiana planter in favor of the (Wilmot) proviso! The INTOLERABLE ABSURDITY of such a proposition scarcely permits us to treat it with any seriousness."

In July last "the Democrats of Charleston" (S. C.), says the National Intelligencer of July 26, "held a large and enthusiastic meeting, in which the prominent and leading Democrats of the city took part." This meeting passed a series of resolutions, one repudiating Gen. Cass because he is willing to let the people of the territories exclude slavery if they see fit! The following are extracts from these resolutions.

"The opinions of Gen. Cass, promulgated in his late letter, that the inhabitants of a territory, before they are invested with the attributes of self-government and sovereignty—tenants of the public lands at the sufferance of the States—mere squatters—have the right to appropriate the territory that may be acquired by the treasure or gallantry of all the States, and to exclude from its limits the property of fourteen of the States—has been repudiated by the Press and the people of the whole South. *It is a doctrine too monstrous to be tolerated—an ostracism too degrading to be endured.*"

"Resolved, That we regard the issue now made between the States of this Union, styling themselves the free States and the States in which the institution of domestic servitude exists, *as paramount to all questions which can be presented.* That the convention of delegates from fifteen sovereign States for the accomplishment of a purpose which is the first step towards the abolition of slavery in the States, and consequently the ruin of the people in the loss of their property, and their degradation in this lawless violation of their rights, admonishes us of a stern necessity that calls for our immediate, prompt, and decided action. That in seeking one under whose lead we shall look for the best guidance in our difficulties, we turn to him, who, in the simplicity of his habits, illustrates the equality of our privileges, and in his devotion to his country, teaches us the reverence due to the institutions developed by our revolution. That with such a leader we may hope that the dangers which surround us may be happily averted. But if this hope is disappointed, we shall be best prepared to maintain our just rights, and the integrity of our whole country under his direction, who has already announced to the enemies of his country that 'GENERAL TAYLOR NEVER SURRENDERS.'"

In the address we have the following statement of South Carolina doctrine upon this subject:

"To us it matters not how this insult and wrong can be effected. If

in ANY WAY it can be done, we are by its exercise degraded and sunk. If the territories are the common property of the States, and if the Southern States are equal in their sovereignty and independence with the other States, our true position is, that in the territories which belong to the United States, *neither the Congress of the United States, nor the local government of such territories have any power to pass any law which shall interfere with the free enjoyment of such territories by the people of any of these United States, and with such property as they may choose to take there with them.* We have the opinion of Gen. Cass that there is a mode by which this prohibition can be constitutionally exercised, and when we vote for him, we confirm his opinion, and in so doing, admit our own inferiority."

These South Carolina Democrats do not object to Gen. Cass, because he pledges himself to veto the Wilmot Proviso, but because he adopts the "monstrous" doctrine that the people of the territories should be allowed to exclude slavery if they wish to! They object to Gen. Cass on this ground alone, and adopt General Taylor as the sounder man of the two! The address thus speaks of Gen. Taylor:

"His interests are our interests. *We know that he must feel the lawless character of any attempt to interfere with our property directly—we know that he must feel the senseless clamor that is raised to disturb our possession of that property, as violating the law either of God or man. WE KNOW THAT IN THIS GREAT, PARAMOUNT, AND LEADING QUESTION OF THE RIGHTS OF THE SOUTH, HE IS OF US, HE IS WITH US, AND HE IS FOR US.*"

Still later, "a large and enthusiastic meeting of the Taylor Democrats" has been held in the same place. These extracts are taken from the account given of the meeting by the Charleston news.

"*The preamble and resolutions throughout breathe the proper spirit. They adopt the views of Mr. Calhoun, and carry them out with decided strength. Recognizing the vital principle, that which is essential to our Union, and without which it cannot exist, that "Southern men must feel a stronger affinity to each other than to the citizens of the non-Slaveholding States, no matter to which party they may belong."* These resolutions strongly urge the necessity of union at the South for the sake of the South. **ON THIS GROUND DO THEY URGE THE NOMINATION OF GENERAL TAYLOR.**

"The North has selected its man, and with no other man will that portion of the Union be satisfied, unless he comes from the North. *We of the South, if indeed we love the South, must go for the man of the South. Let those who denounce us as Whigs, because we support Gen. Taylor, denounce Mr. Calhoun, who has fraternized with Mr. Berrien, and Mr. Butler, who has fraternized with Mr. Mangum.* We have no doubt that the preamble and resolutions, when published, will exhibit the advocates of Gen. Taylor in that light which reveals their true position. They go for the South, and for GEN. TAYLOR, BECAUSE HE IS THE MAN OF THE SOUTH."

The same paper had previously said:—

"If we cannot trust him who owns Southern slaves and Western mules, raises cotton, and is devoted to agriculture, lives in the heart of the Slave section—who obtained his nomination by the Southern and Western votes almost exclusively, and will only be elected by them—and who has always shown a Roman firmness—whom can we trust? While we should pledge our support to him as a Southern man, and upon this issue, we should give it only in this view."

The National Intelligencer, of June 17, contains the following:—

From the Savannah (Ga.) Republican.

"The heart of every Whig throughout the Union, and of every true patriot of whatever party, must bound with exultation at the tidings of the nomi-

nation of ZACHARY TAYLOR for the Presidency, and the consequent certainty of his elevation to that high office."

* * * * *

"To the South he must be far more acceptable than any other man in this broad Union, for he is a Southern man and a slaveholder—one of ourselves—and no 'Northern man with Southern principles.'"

The following is taken

From the Columbus (Ga) Enquirer.

"LOOK OUT."

"A desperate attempt is making, and will be made, to impress on the public mind the belief that Gen. Taylor is not thoroughly with the South on the subject of slavery. Such an attempt will only prove to what resorts our opponents are driven, in order to injure him in the estimation of his admirers. Why, who is General Taylor? and where does he live? Everybody knows that he is a citizen of Louisiana—an extensive and successful farmer—and owns more slaves than the rest of his slanderers can ever hope honestly to obtain. Is there any fear of such a man on this subject? Born in a slave State, and still residing in one—with a large portion of his capital invested in this species of property—identified from interest, inclination, and education, with the institutions around us—will any sensible man hesitate on this subject to prefer him over his opponent? * * *"

From the Augusta (Ga.) Republic.

"Our Democratic friends will find that they have come upon a *mare's nest* in this matter. They might as well give it up at once, for though they may be 'as brisk as a bee in a tar pot' for a while, in making the charge, they will find themselves *stuck fast* by it before they are done. The General owns too many of the 'niggers' for that; and he will not go for the Proviso till somebody can make one of the blackest ones white, by washing him."

From the Marion (Ala.) Review of July 6.

GENERAL TAYLOR AND THE WILMOT PROVISIO.

"Democratic Editors must be possessed with a feeling something akin to desperation, when they think it necessary, in order to sustain the Democratic cause, to accuse Gen. Taylor of unsoundness on the question of slavery. The charge carries such an absurdity on its very face, as not to deserve a serious refutation. General Taylor, a Southern man, the destiny of himself and his children identified with that of the South, his immense wealth consisting in slaves, and land which has to be cultivated by slaves to render it valuable—*he an enemy to the South?—he in favor of prostrating Southern rights and interests!! The very quintessence of absurdity. They might as well say that General Taylor is a free negro.* They would be believed just about as soon, and exhibit fully as much reason and truth in making the charge."

The Aberdeen (Ala.) Whig says :—

"An eventful, thrilling and highly dangerous crisis has been forced upon the country by LOCOFOCO DEMAGOGUES, regardless of the sanctity of that Union, which is so dear to every patriotic American Citizen. THE WILMOT PROVISIO, AS IT IS CALLED, HAS OPENED A FEARFUL MINE BENEATH THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE SACRED CONSTITUTION. THAT MINE MAY EXPLODE AT THE HOUR OF MIDNIGHT, AND FOREVER DESTROY THE PROUDEST FABRIC OF HUMAN GENIUS AND VIRTUE. To avert this THREATENED EVIL, to close the MIGHTY CHASM that begins to yawn between the free and slave States, is a duty we owe to ourselves, to our posterity, to the memory of the illustrious dead. How shall this be done?"

"We must elect a man for a President of the United States who lives in our own sunny South; who is willing to peril all for the Constitution, who LOVES THE SOUTH and HER CHERISHED INSTITUTIONS."

* * * * *

"Such a man is General Zachary Taylor. HE LIVES IN THE SOUTH, AND MAKES 1200 BALES OF COTTON ON THE BANKS OF THE MISSISSIPPI. HIS INTERESTS, HIS FEELINGS ARE ALL WITH US."

At a Taylor ratification meeting at Tuscaloosa, June 24, the following resolution was adopted:—

“Resolved, That Congress has no right whatever to legislate directly or indirectly, mediately or immediately upon the question of Slavery, nor to make any condition with regard to that subject in the acquisition of territory acquired by the nation, either in peace or war; nor have the settlers upon any such territory, while it is a territory, the authority to interfere with or prohibit the removal to it of any property, whether slaves or otherwise, carried to it by emigrants from any State of the Union. That while we express the fullest confidence in our Northern brethren, and will not anticipate from them any governmental action violative of the principles herein declared; yet in reference to it we hereby solemnly declare that we are ONE upon it; that we will suffer no interference, submit to no concession, and make no compromise. That upon this topic we FEEL, and will ACT as Southern men; maintain at all hazards, and defend at all points, our right in the matter, and STAND OR FALL together in asserting and preserving it.”

The Natchez (Miss.) Courier says:—

“ * * We have not the slightest doubt but that OLD ZACK is as much opposed to the infamous proposition of that leading Locofoco of Pennsylvania, Wilmot, who first introduced the resolution to exclude slavery from any territory that may be retained west of the Rio Grande, as any man in Mississippi.”*

The same paper says of the charge that he would sign a Wilmot Proviso bill:—

“This MONSTROUS assertion—so entirely at war with the character of the man and the tenor of his whole life—could only have been made by political leaders when in the LAST STAGES of DÉSPERATION—when they saw that everlasting political ROUT and RUIN were approaching them as fast as the course of time would permit.”

The New Orleans Bee — a Taylor press, and good authority, too — says:—

“Gen. Taylor is from birth, association, and conviction, identified with the South and her institutions; being one of the most extensive slaveholders in Louisiana—and supported by the slaveholding interest as opposed to the Wilmot Proviso, AND IN FAVOR OF SECURING THE PRIVILEGE TO THE OWNERS OF SLAVES TO REMOVE WITH THEM TO NEWLY ACQUIRED TERRITORY.”

The same paper speaks of the *“contemptibly ludicrous”* accusation, *“that Gen. Taylor is an advocate of the Wilmot Proviso”*—whilst

“Mr. Benjamin, one of the whig electors for the state of Louisiana, affirmed, in a speech at Baton Rouge, Gen. Taylor’s own residence, that the old general was ‘all right’ upon the slavery question, adding, ‘I CAN ASSURE MY FELLOW CITIZENS HERE THAT TAYLOR WILL PROMPTLY VETO ANY THING LIKE THE WILMOT PROVISIO. THE INTERESTS OF THE SOUTH ARE SAFE IN HIS HANDS.’”

Other similar extracts might be almost indefinitely adduced; and it should be constantly borne in mind, that these are the arguments of Gen. Taylor’s friends. Is anything more needed, to prove that the most ultra-slavery propagandists support him as sound, in their views?

But we are not obliged to rely upon this indirect evidence (however satisfactory) of Gen. Taylor’s unsoundness, for we have direct testimony of his opposition to the Wilmot Proviso. Shortly after Gen. Taylor’s return from Mexico, the Legislature of Mississippi appointed a Committee to wait on him, and invite him to Jackson (the seat of

government of Mississippi), to partake of the hospitalities of the State. This Committee had a conversation with him. At the instance of the Hon. John M. Botts, Whig member of Congress from Virginia, Mr. Jacob Thompson, member of Congress from Mississippi, wrote a letter to Mr. Boone, a member of the Committee, to ascertain precisely what was said by Gen. Taylor. Mr. Boone replied, and the letter was handed to Mr. Botts, who published the following extract from it in his Address "to the whole Whig party of the United States," p. 8:—

"In regard to the conversation had with Gen. Taylor, I have to say, we did not talk on the tariff, we did on the war. He expressed himself IN FAVOR OF THE WAR, he said he was DECIDEDLY IN FAVOR OF PROSECUTING IT VIGOROUSLY, till they should yield to an honorable peace. HE WAS FOR INDEMNITY CERTAIN, AND THAT TERRITORIAL; was not wedded to any line, particularly, but thought perhaps as a kind of compromise with the Wilmot Proviso men, we had better go up to the 32d°, making the Rio Grande the Western boundary up to that degree, and said the SOUTH SHOULD NEVER AGREE TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE WILMOT PROVISIO; *although he did not believe there ever would be slavery there, yet if the country was acquired THE CITIZENS SHOULD BE LEFT FREE ON THAT SUBJECT. HE SAYS ALL MEXICO WILL EVENTUALLY COME INTO OUR GOVERNMENT BY DEGREES; THAT IT CANNOT BE AVOIDED.* On the subject of politics he said he was no politician; had been three-fourths of his life in the army; devoted his time and mind to that service, and paid but little attention to anything else."*

* It is said that this conversation never took place. The following is taken from the Boston Daily Advertiser, of Oct. 11:

The Worcester True Whig, having taken some pains to examine this matter, now publishes the following letter on the subject, for which it vouches:

"WASHINGTON CITY, Aug. 4, 1848.

Dear Sir:—I have seen Hon. Mr. Tompkins, of Mississippi, and have inquired of him as to the reports in the newspapers of answers given by Gen. Taylor to the committee of the Legislature of Mississippi. He says that the chairman of that committee was General Henry, a Whig and particular friend of his, from whom he has received *long and minute letters, detailing the visit of the committee to General Taylor, their reception, the speeches made on the occasion, CONVERSATION, description of the General's house, &c., in all of which he does not allude to or mention any conversation upon party politics.* The committee was composed of gentlemen of both parties; they were authorized to invite the General to accept of the hospitalities of the State, which he declined on the ground that he could not safely leave his place of residence for one day, on account of his official correspondence with the War Department. Mr. Tompkins believes that the statements alluded to, of answers to the committee by General Taylor, published in the newspapers, *are false, and made for electioneering purposes, and not entitled to the least confidence.*"

The evidence of Mr. Boone's deception, therefore, is contained in an anonymous letter, written by *somebody*, in Washington, last August, to *somebody* else, giving an account of a conversation the first *somebody* had with the Hon. Mr. Tompkins, of Mississippi, over two months ago, and which letter has been *kept entirely secret* until it is too LATE to get a contradiction or explanation from Mr. Boone. *What reliance can be placed on such evidence? In a matter of the slightest consequence, none whatever!*

But, suppose these two somebodies to be well known, respectable men; how then does the case stand? "Long and minute letters" have been received from General Henry, "detailing the visit of the committee to Gen. Taylor, their reception, the speeches made on the occasion, conversation, description of the General's house, &c., in all of which *he does not allude to or mention any conversation upon party politics.*" Suppose he do not make any such allusion to Gen. Taylor's remarks on the Wilmot Proviso, is that the *slightest* evidence that no such remarks were made? If half a dozen honest men listen to a conversation, and one states that a certain remark was made, whilst another states something else that was said, *without alluding at all* to the other remark, whether it was or was not made, is the *mere silence* of the second witness to be taken as any evidence *whatever* that the first witness has deceived? Most certainly not. And yet General Henry stands precisely in the position of this second witness. It is not even pretended that Gen. Henry says that Mr. Boone was mistaken, or has deceived. Indeed there is not the least intimation that Mr. Boone's report was suggested to Gen. Henry, or that his opinion of its correctness was asked. All that is

In order that there might be no mistake about this conversation, the following letter was sent to Mr. Botts :—

“*Boston, Sept. 5, 1848.*”

“DEAR SIR,— Will you be kind enough to inform me, whether the conversation between Gen. Taylor and the Committee of the Mississippi Legislature, of which an account is enclosed, actually occurred as stated? and whether you have ever published it in the newspapers, or in any address, as genuine?”

“So many stories are in circulation, that one hardly knows what to believe. Pardon me for troubling you, but if you will answer the above questions, it will serve to remove some difficulties in the path of many persons who do not know whether, or not, Gen. T. ever said the South ought not to consent to the provisions of the Wilmot Proviso. Respectfully Yours, WILLIAM I. BOWDITCH.”

In answer, Mr. Bowditch received through the Post Office a pamphlet copy of the address to the Whig party, above referred to, franked by John M. Botts; and on the first page was written the following :—

“The passage marked on pp. 7, 8, contains all that I know on this subject. *The original letter of Mr. Boone, the writer, is in my possession—the conversation related, has never been denied that I am aware of.*

“J. M. B.”

The passage on p. 8 is the extract from Mr. Boone's letter, just given. Speaking of this letter, Hon. J. R. Giddings, in his speech at the Buffalo convention, said :—

or can be said, is that Gen. Henry preserves entire silence concerning the conversation reported by Mr. Boone. *He do n't say whether or not he believes it—whether or not he heard it—whether or not it took place!* It is folly to argue that such mere silence is to outweigh or affect in the slightest degree the positive evidence of an honest witness.

Mr. Tompkins “believes” Mr. Boone's report false. Perhaps he does. But what does he personally know about it? *Nothing at all!* All his information comes from Gen. Henry's silence. Where are these significantly silent letters of Gen. Henry? They have been known to exist for two months. During all this time, the report of Mr. Boone has been constantly the theme of the Free Soil papers. *Produce them all, without garbling, if any argument is to be based merely on their silence.*

But, says the Advertiser, the ‘Whig’ is not contented with giving this testimony. It adds:

“And now, once more, we state to these presses which are spreading forged lies, that as to this reported conversation between the Mississippi committee and Gen. Taylor about the Wilmot Proviso, GEN. TAYLOR HAS CONTRADICTED IT UNDER HIS OWN SIGN MANUAL. THIS WE KNOW. WE HAVE SEEN AND READ THAT CONTRADICTION WITH THE NAME OF ZACHARY TAYLOR AFFIXED TO IT.”

If this authoritative contradiction really exists, and has been seen and read by the writer in the Whig, and the Whig thinks it of sufficient consequence to state the existence of such contradiction—WHY IS NOT THE CONTRADICTION ITSELF PUBLISHED? Who now has it in his custody? Nobody knows! To whom was it sent by Gen. Taylor? Nobody knows! When it was reported that Gen. Taylor had bought slaves in Washington, Gen. Taylor contradicted the report, and his friends with the utmost haste published, far and wide, his contradiction. The comparatively unimportant rumor is contradicted under the General's own signature. But upon this infinitely more important point of the General's views on the Wilmot Proviso—when his supporters have, as they say, a document from him, which, if true, will strike the Free Soil party with a deadly blow—they are so very confident of its truth that they dare not publish it, *we must beg leave to doubt even its existence.* Of what weight as evidence is a letter or document, the holders of which, whoever they are, do not give their names—who do not venture to say to whom it was sent by Gen. Taylor, or even to give extracts from it? Are we to believe the assertions of a nameless writer, who does not pretend or venture to give Gen. Taylor's words? Common sense forbids it! On the very eve of the election, some pretended letter from Gen. Taylor may appear, too late for the fraud to be exposed. We warn our fellow citizens against being thus deceived. It is now more than six months since Hon. J. M. Botts, of Va., who supports Gen. Taylor, as a choice of evils, published in his letter to the people of the U. S. this testimony of Col. Boone. If the statement could have been fairly refuted, would it not, long ago, have been done?

"I will tell you about another letter, written by Col. Boone to the Hon. Jacob Thompson, member of congress from Mississippi. I have the word of Mr. Thompson for saying, that Col. Boone's integrity was never doubted and never will be denied. He said to me that I was at full liberty to say that he, Mr. Thompson, fully endorsed him as a man of truth and unsullied honor. It will be remembered that Col. Boone was one of a committee of five deputed by the legislature of Mississippi to invite Gen. Taylor to visit that body. The conversation detailed in the letter was had in the presence of that committee, two of whom were whigs. These whigs having seen the letter in print, have suffered it to pass as true and correct."

There can be no doubt about the *authenticity* or *truthfulness* of the report of this conversation. *It is no anonymous production.* It is reported by Mr. Boone, a member of the Committee, and his original letter is now in the possession of Hon. John M. Botts, a *supporter* of Gen. Taylor, "though not an ultra one." The extract given above was published last March by Mr. Botts, in his pamphlet address above spoken of, and very widely circulated in that form. It has also been *very extensively* published in the newspapers, since that time; and the truthfulness of the report has never yet been denied by Gen. Taylor—by any other member of the Committee—by any one who heard the conversation—or by the authority of Gen. Taylor, or any one who heard it. Gen. Taylor has, by writing three times under his own hand, *contradicted* the interpretation given to the Signal letter, (so called), which interpretation made him out as expressing the opinion that he would not veto the Wilmot Proviso. He has also, in writing, *contradicted* the report that he had bought slaves in Washington; *but he has never yet thus contradicted the truth of Mr. Boone's report of his conversation, or authorized its contradiction.* His friends can, at any moment, get such a contradiction from him, if it is not truly stated. But they have not, as yet, dared to call upon him to speak out.

We have, then, an undoubtedly authentic letter from a man, described to be a man "of truth, and unsullied honor," detailing a conversation had in his presence, in which conversation Gen. Taylor openly avowed his opposition to the Wilmot Proviso, and his opinion that the question of slavery in the territories should be left to the citizens there, to decide as they pleased. With the exception that he does not specify the *grounds* of his opposition to the Proviso, the opinions of Gen. Cass and Gen. Taylor are identical. There is no difference in their opinions on the Wilmot Proviso.

The Mobile (Ala.) Herald publishes a communication, dated East Pascagoula, Aug. 19, 1848, from one of its correspondents. Of itself alone, it is of little value. It is of some weight as a confirmation. The following extracts are taken from this communication. Speaking of Gen. Taylor, the correspondent says:—

"The old man seems to be frank and without craft. He shuns no topic, and as far as I could discover, is accustomed to utter his opinions without regard to politicians or newspaper editors. Last evening, a group of some dozen or more of us was gathered round him, eagerly listening to an animated conversation, in which his *naïve* simplicity of manner was quite charming. He ran through various topics, which he illustrated with excellent sense and varied information. *Speaking of the "free soil" movement in the North, he expressed fears that it would be the absorbing question in the present canvass, and engross all other questions. HE SAID THAT HE CONSIDERED THE "MISSOURI COMPROMISE" A FAIR AND LIBERAL LINE FOR SETTLING THE SLAVE QUESTION, AND HE WAS WILLING TO SEE IT ADOPTED.*

* * * * *

My object was to see 'Old Zack;' and I gathered enough of what I

saw of him to believe that he is an honest man — not politic — not afraid — resolute — moderate — steering between the ultras, and *Southern enough in his nature to be quite worthy of as much honor as we can lay on his shoulders.*"

The Whig party, therefore, stands before the country with a Presidential candidate who has avowed himself to be opposed to the Wilmot Proviso—who thinks, with General Cass, that the people in the territories should be left free to admit slavery if they please—one who, by birth, education, and interest, is identified with slavery—who is himself a large slaveholder in that section of the country where slavery exists in its most revolting forms—who lives in a section where the most ultra slavery notions prevail—who at the South was first suggested as a candidate, by the most ultra slavery propagandists—who was eminently the candidate of the slave States, in the national convention—and who is now supported by men who consider slavery almost, if not quite, the corner-stone of the Republic? Only last autumn, the Whigs of Norfolk County resolved that it was their "duty" not to vote for any man, for President and Vice President, "*who are not known by their acts, or declared opinions, to be opposed to the extension of slavery.*" What has become of their high resolve, when they now call upon us to vote for a man who says, that the South should never agree to any restriction by Congress upon such extension? and who thinks that the people of California and New Mexico should be left free to establish slavery if they wish to?

But it is said that he is a Whig, and that opposition to the extension of slavery is Whig doctrine. True it is that he styles himself a Whig, and has accepted the nomination of the Whig convention. But in his letter published in the Charleston (S. C.) News, (Aug. 16,) he has not only said, that he "would have accepted the nomination of the Baltimore convention, had it been tendered on the same terms" as that of the Whigs, but he has actually "thankfully accepted" the nomination of the Charleston Democrats who repudiated Gen. Cass because he was only pledged to veto the Proviso. We do not now lay any stress on these circumstances. We will suppose that Gen. Taylor, if elected, will carry out the true Whig doctrine on this question. What is the true doctrine of the great Whig party? Not surely Massachusetts doctrine, or Louisiana doctrine, but that which is the doctrine of the Whigs in *all* the States. Where can we find an exposition of the doctrine of the whole Whig party, if not in the doings of the convention of the whole Whig party? The following extracts are taken from the National Intelligencer's account of the doings of the Philadelphia convention. We have, then, the highest exponent of Whig doctrine, as published in the leading Whig journal:—

"Mr. TILDEN, of Ohio. Will the gentleman give way for one moment? I have a resolution to offer, which was drawn up by all the delegation from Ohio; and the vote of Ohio will depend considerably upon the consideration which the Convention may give to this resolution.

"The resolution was as follows:

"*Resolved*, That while all power is denied to Congress under the constitution to control or in any manner interfere with the institution of slavery within the several States of this Union, it nevertheless has the power and it is the duty of Congress to prohibit the introduction or existence of slavery in any territory now possessed, or which may hereafter be acquired by the United States."

* * * * *

"Mr. TILDEN said he did not desire to make a speech, but he wished to say what the feelings of the Whigs of Ohio were. They were embodied

in the resolution which he had read. They had been proclaimed at all their primary meetings; they had been set forth in their State Convention; and the delegation from Ohio therefore felt constrained to put forth this resolution, and to ask for its adoption by this Convention, for it was a part of their political faith.

"Mr. BROWN, of Pennsylvania, was surprised to see such a resolution offered to this Convention, and that gentlemen should come here with an evident determination to distract their counsels. They had listened to the language which had been uttered by gentlemen with patience, but things might go so far that patience might cease to be a virtue. *They were assembled there to carry out the glorious Whig principles, and were they to be diverted from their purpose by a set of factionists?* [Applause and hisses.] He moved that the resolution be laid on the table.

"The motion to lay on the table was agreed to."

In the opinion of the Philadelphia convention, the principle of "no more slave territory," is *not* one of "the glorious Whig principles." The convention was not to be diverted from their purpose "by a set of factionists," whose object was to arrest the further extension of slavery! The following extracts will suffice to show how this action of the convention is looked upon by the *anti-slavery* slave-holding Whigs at the South:—

"GLORIOUS NEWS.—THE UNION PRESERVED.—THE REPUDIATION OF THE WILMOT PROVISIO BY THE WHIG CONVENTION." Under the above head the Montgomery (Alabama) Journal, a Whig paper, announces with inexpressible satisfaction, that the Whig Convention promptly met the question of the Wilmot proviso, and repudiated a resolution adopting that doctrine at once, by an overwhelming majority. It would not touch the unclean thing.

From the Macon (Ala.) Republican.

"WILMOT PROVISIO REPUDIATED BY THE WHIG CONVENTION.

"What will the Locofocos say now—they who have all along contended, against light and knowledge, and in utter contempt of truth, that Provisioism was chiefly confined to the Whig party? Who are now the friends of the South? Alas for Democracy! The Whigs of the Union have met and decided this momentous question—they have repudiated it like men, like patriots, like Whigs! They have indignantly refused to give it countenance! They have rejected it by a decided and overwhelming majority!

"A resolution was introduced into the Whig National Convention, recognising and adopting the Wilmot Proviso; but it was rejected almost unanimously, without discussion. It was treated as a stranger—as a thing entirely out of place. The only wonder is, how it came there—being, as it is, a bantling of Locofoco paternity. The thing was generated and warmed into life by the Democracy, nurtured and sustained by its natural parent, and of course possessed no affinity with Whiggery—and, consequently, it was hooted out of the Convention."

The same paper of July 6, says:—

"A resolution was offered by a delegate from Ohio, affirming the principles of the Wilmot Proviso. Mr. Brown, of Pennsylvania, denounced it as fanatical, and indignantly moved to lay it on the table. The cry was raised, to make this a test vote. Agreed, was shouted on all sides; and it was laid there; *not ten votes being in its favor!*"

But besides this action of the Convention, we have the best of evidence that the Wilmot Proviso is not a party question. Judge Berrien, the Whig, opposes the proviso, side by side with John C. Calhoun, the Democrat; and John M. Clayton, already more than once spoken of as Whig candidate for the presidency, on July 5 last, in the Senate, said:—

"We repudiate the question altogether as a political question: and I say, that whenever the members of the great Taylor republican party, which I hold at this moment to be the great majority of the country, shall descend so low as to make a geographical party out of this Wilmot Proviso, with a view to President-making or getting offices and power in the country, they will lose my respect, and I think that of every honest man. An attempt is now being made, to force this upon us as a party question by the extreme partisans of the North and the South. *But neither the one side nor the other of the question forms any part of our platform*; and I hope there will be patriotism enough among the American people to keep the question apart from party politics forever."

And who was pronounced by Mr. Winthrop, recently, at Worcester, to be a *sounder and better Whig* than Judge Berrien? * Let no one, therefore, say, that because Gen. Taylor says he is a Whig, therefore he is in favor of the Wilmot Proviso; for the Whig Convention has repudiated the proviso with contumely, and leading Whigs declare it not to be part of the Whig platform.

It is also said that Gen. Taylor is pledged not to veto the proviso, if passed by Congress. The Whigs do not say that he is opposed to the extension of slavery, or that he is in favor of the proviso; but only that he is pledged not to veto it if passed. This pledge has been said to be contained in the following letter from Gen. Taylor to the editor of the Cincinnati "Morning Signal":—

*"Headquarters, Army of Occupation,
Camp near Monterey, May 18, 1847.*

"SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter with the enclosure of your editorial, extracted from the Signal of the 13th April.

* The following extract from a letter written by Judge Berrien to a Taylor meeting in Georgia, is taken from the "Southern Whig" published at Athens, Georgia.

"We take the liberty of publishing an extract from the letter of our distinguished Senator, Judge Berrien, in answer to the invitation tendered by the Committee through the writer of this. It will show our distant readers what degree of confidence can be placed in the ridiculous slander, that this faithful, able, and eloquent guardian of Southern rights would not support Gen. Taylor in the approaching contest. After stating that he is prevented from attending the meeting by sickness in his family, he adds:

"I ask you to make known to our fellow-citizens who will, be assembled on the 30th inst., the reason why I am not with them, not so much to explain my absence, for that is comparatively unimportant, as to enable me through the proper organs of the meeting to say to them how deeply important I feel it to be, that we should work with "might and main" in the present canvass—that I consider it as the most important Presidential election, especially to SOUTHERN MEN, which has occurred since the foundation of the Government.

"We have great and important interests at stake—if we fail to sustain them now, we may be forced too soon to decide whether we will remain in the Union at the mercy of a band of fanatics or political jugglers—or reluctantly retire from it for the preservation of our domestic institutions, and all our rights as freemen. If we are united we can sustain them—if we divide on the old party issues, we must be victims.

"WITH A HEART DEVOTED TO THEIR INTERESTS ON THIS GREAT QUESTION, AND WITHOUT RESPECT TO PARTY, I implore my fellow-citizens of Georgia, Whig and Democratic, to FORGET FOR THE TIME THEIR PARTY DIVISIONS—TO KNOW EACH OTHER ONLY AS SOUTHERN MEN—to act upon the truism uttered by Mr. Calhoun, that on this VITAL QUESTION—the preservation of our domestic institutions, the Southern man who is farthest from us, is nearer to us than any Northern man can be—that Gen. Taylor is identified with us in feeling and interest—was born in a slaveholding State—educated in a slaveholding State—is himself a slaveholder—that his slave property constitutes the means of support to himself and family—that he cannot desert us, without sacrificing his interest, his principles, the habits and feelings of his life—and that with him, therefore, our institutions are safe. I beseech them, therefore, from the love which they bear to our noble State, to rally under the banner of Zachary Taylor, and with one united voice to send him by acclamation to the Executive chair."

Respectfully, your fellow-citizen,
J. McPHERSON BERRIEN.

Mr. J. H. CHRISTY.

"At this time my public duties command so fully my attention, that it is impossible to answer your letter in the terms demanded by its courtesy, and the importance of the sentiments to which it alludes; neither, indeed, have I the time, should I feel myself at liberty, to enter into the few and most general subjects of public policy suggested by the article in question. *My own personal views were better withheld till the end of the war*, when my usefulness as a military chief, serving in the field against the common enemy, shall no longer be compromised by their expression or discussion in any manner.

"From many sources I have been addressed on the subject of the Presidency; and I do violence neither to myself, nor to my position as an officer of the army, by acknowledging to you, as I have done to all who have alluded to the use of my name in this exalted connection, that my services are ever at the will and call of the country, and that I am not prepared to say that I shall refuse if the country calls me to the Presidential office, but that I can and shall yield to no call that does not come from the spontaneous action and free will of the nation at large, and void of the slightest agency of my own.

"For the high honor and responsibility of such an office, I take occasion to say, I have not the slightest aspiration. A much more tranquil and satisfactory life, after the termination of my present duties, awaits me, I trust, in the society of my family and particular friends, and in the occupations most congenial to my wishes. In no case can I permit myself to be the candidate of any party, or yield myself to party schemes.

"With these remarks, I trust you will pardon me for thus briefly replying to you, which I do with a high opinion and *approval of the sentiments and views embraced in your editorial*.

"With many wishes for your prosperity in life, and great usefulness in the sphere in which your talents and exertions are embarked, I beg to acknowledge myself,

Most truly and respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

Z. TAYLOR, Maj. Gen. U. S. Army.

James W. Taylor, Esq. Cincinnati, O."

The following is an extract from the long editorial which was sent to Gen. Taylor. It appeared in the Signal of April 13, 1847: —

"The American people are about to assume the responsibility of framing the institutions of the Pacific states. We have no fears for the issue, if the arena of the high debate is the assemblies of the people and their representative halls. *The extension over the continent beyond the Rio Grande of the ordinance of 1787, is an object too high and permanent to be baffled by presidential vetoes. All that we ask of the incumbent of the highest office under the constitution, is to hold his hand, to bow to the will of the people as promulgated in legislative forms, and restrain the executive action in its appropriate channels!* Give us an honest administration of the government, and an end to all cabals of a cabinet — all interference from the White House — designed to sway or thwart the action of the American people. If such simplicity and integrity should guide the administration of Gen. Taylor, the North and West would yield to it a warm support and hearty approval."

Notwithstanding Gen. Taylor says, in the first part of his letter, "My own personal views were better withheld till the end of the war," — thus leaving it to be inferred that he did not mean then to express his views, — still he expresses his *approval* of the sentiments and views embraced in the editorial. Among these views is this: that the veto power ought not to be used, to prevent the extension of the ordinance of 1787 over the territories west of the Rio Grande. Hence it would be fairly enough argued, that Gen. Taylor will not veto the Wilmot Proviso if passed by Congress, if he had not written the following letter to the editor of the Tuscaloosa (Ala.) Monitor, who has published it with Gen. Taylor's leave: —

*"Headquarters, Army of Occupation,
Camp near Monterey, Nov. 1847.*

"SIR,—Your letter of the 4th ult. has been received. In reply to your remarks concerning a letter which I addressed some time since to the editor of the Cincinnati Signal, *I have no hesitation in stating that it was not my intention in that communication to express an opinion either in concurrence with or in opposition to any of the views embraced in the editorial to which it refers.*

"The letter itself, like most other letters of mine on unofficial matters which have found their way into the newspapers, was not intended for publication, but simply written as a matter of courtesy in answer to one which I had received from the gentleman in question. For this object, it was entirely sufficient; though, under the belief that it would never go beyond this point, it is quite probable that it may not have been prepared with that care and critical accuracy which appears to be so much required by politicians. *It was simply my desire, on that occasion, as has been my custom uniformly through life, to express my respect for opinions which I believed to be honestly entertained, and, as long as thus held, my approval of his maintaining them.*

"Should it ever become my official duty to give my opinions on any or all of the political questions referred to in the article above mentioned, I shall discharge the duty to the best of my judgment. Until then, my opinions on such matters are neither necessary nor important.

"I need hardly add, in conclusion, that this communication is not intended for the public prints.

"I am, Sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
Z. TAYLOR.
Major General U. S. A."

A similar letter was written to Mr. James R. Doolittle, of Wyoming, N. Y., but it is unnecessary to cite it; as this alone is sufficient to show that the Northern interpretation of the Signal letter is wrong. Mr. B. M. McConkey, of Cincinnati, published in the Cincinnati Atlas, of July 21, 1848, the following communication and letter:—

"MR. EDITOR,—Last February, I addressed a letter to General Taylor, propounding three interrogatories. Two of them are immaterial at the present time; the third was as follows:—

"Should you become President of the United States, would you veto an act of Congress which should prohibit slavery or involuntary servitude forever, except for crime, in all the territories of the United States, where it does not now exist?

"As General Taylor's reply may assist the interpreter of the Allison letter, I offer it for publication. It is as follows:—

"Baton Rouge, La., Feb. 15, 1848.

"SIR.—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 3d inst.

"In reply to your enquiries, I have to inform you that *I have laid it down as a principle, not to give my opinions upon, or prejudice in any way the various questions of policy now at issue between the political parties of the country, nor to promise what I would or would not do were I elected to the Presidency of the United States; and that in the cases presented in your letter, I regret to add, I see no reason for departing from this principle.*

"With my profound acknowledgments for the friendly sentiments towards me which you have been pleased to express,

I remain, Sir, with great respect,

Your obd't serv't,
Z. TAYLOR."

Mr. B. M. McConkey, Cincinnati.

This letter is clear and explicit. Gen. Taylor is asked, directly, whether or not he would veto the Wilmot Proviso; and he answers, equally directly, that he has laid it down as a principle not to prom-

ise what he would, or would not do, if elected; or to prejudge, in any way, the various questions of policy at issue between the political parties. *But if, in February, 1848, he had laid it down as a principle not to promise whether he would or would not veto the Wilmot Proviso, it cannot be believed that in May, 1847, he had pledged himself not to veto it.*

Still, however, he is said to have pledged himself in the letter to Capt. Allison, from which the following extracts are taken. It matters not whether this pledge or committal is *expressly* made, or whether it is only a just *inference*, from any general rule or principle laid down in this letter. *In either case, he stands pledged or committed. In either case, Gen. Taylor fully knew, when he was writing the letter, that, as an honest man, he was pledging himself not to veto the proviso.*

Baton Rouge, April 22, 1848

"DEAR SIR,—My opinions have so often been misconceived and misrepresented, that I deem it due to myself, if not to my friends, to make a brief exposition of them upon the topics to which you have called my attention."

* * * * *

"I confess, whilst I have great cardinal principles which will regulate my political life, *I am not sufficiently familiar with all the minute details of political legislation, to give solemn pledges to exert myself to carry out this or defeat that measure. I have no concealments. I hold no opinion which I would not readily proclaim to my assembled countrymen; but crude impressions upon matters of policy, which may be right to day and wrong to-morrow, are, perhaps, not the best tests of fitness for office. One who cannot be trusted without pledges, cannot be confided in merely on account of them.*

"I will proceed, however, now to respond to your inquiries."

* * * * *

"Second—The veto power. The power given by the constitution to the executive to interpose its veto, is a high conservative power; but in my opinion should never be exercised, *except in cases of clear violation of the constitution, or manifest haste and want of consideration by Congress.* Indeed I have thought that for many years past, the known opinions and wishes of the executive have exercised undue and injurious influence upon the legislative department of the government; and for this cause I have thought our system was in danger of undergoing a great change from its true theory. The personal opinions of the individual who may happen to occupy the executive chair, ought not to control the action of Congress upon questions of domestic policy; nor ought his objections to be interposed where questions of constitutional power have been settled by the various departments of government, *and acquiesced in by the people.*

"Third—Upon the subject of the tariff, the currency, the improvement of our great highways, rivers, lakes, and harbors, the will of the people, as expressed through their representatives in Congress, ought to be respected and carried out by the executive."

He says the veto power "should never be exercised except in cases of clear violation of the Constitution, or manifest haste or want of consideration by Congress." But he has never said that the Wilmot Proviso is constitutional. How then can he be said to have pledged himself not to veto it? Southern *Whigs* are united to a man in holding the opinion that the proviso is *not constitutional*.

Thus the Richmond (Va.) Republican says:

"Now for General Taylor, what does he say?—Why, *he says he will stand by the Constitution in the administration of affairs.* Well, *This WILMOT PROVISIO IS MOST UNQUESTIONABLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN EVERY SENSE OF THE TERM, consequently HE IS COMPELLED TO VETO IT, because it would come under that class of measures which he would denominate unconstitutional.*"

What evidence is there that Gen. Taylor does not agree with the writer in the Richmond Republican and the rest of his Southern *Whig* brethren? *None whatever!* But without such evidence, there can be no pledge extorted from the Allison letter.

But, say the friends of Gen. Taylor at the *North*, he will not veto the Proviso, because the questions of the constitutional power to pass it, "have been settled by the various departments of government, and acquiesced in by the people." *This is not really true!* It is not true that slavery has ever yet been excluded from ALL the national territory. It was not done by the ordinance of 1787—because then there evidently was an understanding that the territory *South* of the Ohio was to be *slave*, whilst all *North* of it was to be *free*. South Carolina had authorized her delegates to cede her lands, south of the Ohio, months *before* the ordinance was passed—but the cession was not actually made until one month after; still, however, her lands *really* belonged to the Union at the time the ordinance was passed. North Carolina ceded her Western lands on the express condition that Congress should not "emancipate slaves." Nor was slavery excluded from *all* the territory acquired from France. Another compromise between slavery and freedom was made, and all south of the Missouri compromise line, and the State of Missouri north of it, were allowed to be slave territory. The constitutional power to exclude slavery from really *all* the national territories has, therefore, never yet been settled by the various departments of government, and acquiesced in by the people. The South has always claimed and got for slavery nearly, if not quite, one half of the national territory. But the very thing which it is proposed now to do, in passing the proviso, is *wholly to exclude slavery from all the national domain*; and Gen. Taylor may with perfect truth say,—as the people have never acquiesced in such an exercise of power, and as the various departments of government have never acted on such a proposition; "I am not committed by anything in this letter not to veto it."

Gen. Taylor has been described as plain, blunt, and honest. Would he, with studied language, *covertly* give an opinion upon the most important question of the day? In the next sentence to that we have referred to, he says, that upon the tariff, &c., the will of Congress ought to be respected and carried out by the executive; but he does *not* say that the will of Congress, on the Proviso, ought to be thus respected; and yet in the same breath he says that he holds no opinion which he would not readily proclaim. If, when he comes to enumerate those subjects upon which he thinks the action of Congress ought to be respected by the President, he omits all mention of the Wilmot Proviso—the greatest of all questions—what is the fair inference? Is it that he thinks the action of Congress on this matter, also, should be respected? No!

But what does he say on the subject of pledges? *Only nine weeks* before he wrote the Allison letter, he stated, as we have just seen, in the McConkey letter, that he had laid it down as a principle, not to promise whether he would or would not veto the Wilmot Proviso, and he then acted on the principle. Is it to be supposed that after this deliberate announcement of his principle, he would in the short interval of only two months abandon it wholly, and pledge himself not to veto the Proviso? We cannot believe it possible. And yet this entire abandonment of principle must be believed by all those who think that he is thus pledged.

We have just seen the resolution and address adopted at the

meeting of the Charleston (S. C.) democrats. It will be remembered, that opposition alike to the Wilmot Proviso, and the "*monstrous*" doctrine that the people of the territories should be allowed to exclude slavery if they wished — that is, *deadly hostility to every method there is of preventing slavery extending to the Pacific*, — formed both the corner-stone and superstructure of these resolutions. A newspaper containing these resolutions was forwarded to Gen. Taylor by Mr. Pringle, the chairman of the meeting. In his letter, Mr. Pringle says, "the preamble and resolutions so fully explain the views of my fellow-citizens, as to need no comment from me." There can, therefore, be no doubt that Gen. Taylor read the resolutions, and consequently that he was fully aware that the nomination came from men so thoroughly in favor of the extension of slavery that not even Gen. Cass was acceptable to them. *Gen. Taylor was fully aware that he had been nominated SOLELY because he was believed to be MORE favorable to the extension of slavery than Gen. Cass.* Under these circumstances he wrote the following letter:—

"Baton Rouge, La., Aug. 9, 1848.

"SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 26th ultimo, officially announcing to me my nomination for the presidency by a large meeting of the Democratic citizens of Charleston, S. C., held at that city on the 26th ult., and over which you were the presiding officer.

"This deliberate expression of the friendly feeling existing towards me among a large and respectable portion of the citizens of your distinguished State, has been received by me with *emotions of profound gratitude*; and though it be but a poor return for such high and unmerited honor, I beg them to accept my heartfelt thanks.

"Concluding that this nomination, like all others which I have had the honor of receiving from assemblages of my fellow-citizens in various parts of the Union, has been generously offered me, *without pledges or conditions, it is thankfully accepted*; and I beg you to assure my friends, in whose behalf you are acting, that should it be my lot to fill the office for which I have been nominated, it shall be my unceasing effort, in the discharge of its responsible duties, to give satisfaction to my countrymen.

With the assurances of my high esteem,

I have the honor to be your ob't servant,
Z. TAYLOR.

To W. B. Pringle, Esq."

How, we ask, could Gen. Taylor, simply as an honest man, "thankfully" accept this nomination *if*—less than four months before—he had solemnly pledged or committed himself not to go even as far as Gen. Cass, — if he considered himself pledged or committed *not* to do the *only* thing which made Gen. Cass *at all* acceptable to the South, viz. veto the Wilmot Proviso? Would not Gen. Taylor, or any other honest man, *IF he had been committed in behalf of freedom*, have said to Mr. Pringle, I cannot consent even to *appear* to be the *favoured* candidate of *slavery extensionists*. The sincerity of the candidate for freedom must not even be suspected. Your friends have greatly mistaken my position. I ought to be even more objectionable than Gen. Cass, because my sentiments are not nearly so favorable to your views as his. You made the nomination under a clear mistake as to my opinion. Considering myself committed in behalf of freedom, by the general principles in regard to the veto power, which I have laid down in my letter to Captain Allison, I cannot with any self-respect consent to stand as the candidate of ultra slavery propagandists, and, therefore, decline the nomination. *Your friends would have cut off their right hands sooner than have voted*

for me, if they had known my real sentiments. How can I accept the nomination and conceal my sentiments, thereby deliberately deceiving honest men? WE SAY, THEREFORE, THAT GEN. TAYLOR, OR ANY OTHER HONEST MAN, WOULD HAVE MADE HASTE TO REFUSE THE NOMINATION OF THE CHARLESTON SLAVEHOLDERS, IF HE HAD PLEDGED OR COMMITTED HIMSELF NOT TO VETO THE WILMOT PROVISIO; OR IF HE HAD LAID DOWN A GENERAL RULE OF ACTION, AN ADHERENCE TO WHICH IN HIS OPINION WOULD OBLIGE HIM TO REFRAIN FROM VETOING THE PROVISIO. Inasmuch as he is honest, and has accepted the nomination, we say he cannot consider himself thus pledged or committed.

We know of no other evidence of Gen. Taylor's sentiments besides that which we have examined. Anonymous letters, and the reputed existence of unpublished letters cannot be relied on in a matter of this great moment. No tariff man would for an instant rely upon such evidence as we have considered, in order to prove another to be a protectionist. No Washingtonian would rely upon such evidence to prove another to be a Temperance man. Nor can men who are opposed to the extension of slavery, rely upon such evidence to prove a Louisiana slaveholder to be pledged not to veto a restriction upon such extension.

What, then, is the difference on this great question between the two candidates? Gen. Cass avows his opposition to the Proviso. So does Gen. Taylor. Gen. Cass says that the question of slavery in the territories should be left to be settled by the people of those territories. Gen. Taylor says the people of the territories should be left free to admit slavery if they please. Gen. Cass would *not on any terms* have accepted the nomination of the Buffalo Convention. Gen. Taylor *thankfully* accepts the nomination of men who avow their deadly hostility to everything which can possibly prevent the extension of slavery to the Pacific! What reliable difference, on this great question, is there between the two? None whatever! If one is a Northern man with Southern principles, the other is a Southern man with Southern principles. Both candidates are utterly unworthy the suffrages of a free people.